arXiv:1212.6398v1 [math.GN] 27 Dec 2012

TWO CHARACTERIZATIONS OF REGULAR AND OF STRONGLY REGULAR CONVERGENCE-APPROACH SPACES VIA FUNCTION SPACES

FRÉDÉRIC MYNARD AND WILLIAM TROTT

Abstract. Two classical results characterizing regularity of a convergence space in terms of continuous extensions of maps on one hand, and in terms of continuity of limits for the continuous convergence on the other, are extended to convergence-approach spaces. Characterizations are obtained for two alternative extensions of regularity to convergence-approach spaces: regularity and strong regularity. The results improve upon what is known even in the convergence case. On the way, a new notion of strictness for convergence-approach spaces is introduced.

1. Preliminaries

1.1. **Convergence spaces.** For a set X, we denote the set of all filters on X as $\mathbb{F}X$, and the set of all ultrafilters on X as $\mathbb{U}X$. For $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X$, we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is finer than $\mathcal{G}$, denoted $\mathcal{F}\geq\mathcal{G}$, if for every $G\in\mathcal{G}$, there is an $F\in\mathcal{F}$ such that $F\subseteq G$. We further denote the set of ultrafilters finer than some $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$ as $\mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F})$, and the principal filter of $A\subseteq X$ is denoted $\{A\}^{\uparrow}$. More generally, if $\mathcal{A}\subseteq 2^{X}$ then $\mathcal{A}^{\uparrow}:=\{B\subseteq X:\exists A\in\mathcal{A},\,A\subseteq B\}$. Note that if $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$ and $\mathcal{S}:X\to\mathbb{F}Y$ then

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}):=\bigcup_{F\in\mathcal{F}}\bigcap_{x\in F}\mathcal{S}(x)$$

is a filter on Y.

For some relation ξ between $\mathbb{F}X$ and X, we say that $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$ converges to $x\in X$, denoted $x\in\lim_{\xi}\mathcal{F}$, if $(\mathcal{F},x)\in\xi$. The relation ξ is called a *preconvergence* if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\mathcal{F}\leq\mathcal{G}\Longrightarrow\lim{}_{\xi}\mathcal{F}\subseteq\lim{}_{\xi}\mathcal{G};$$

$$\forall\mathcal{F},\,\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X,\,\lim{}_{\xi}(\mathcal{F}\wedge\mathcal{G})\supseteq\lim{}_{\xi}\mathcal{F}\cap\lim{}_{\xi}\mathcal{G},$$

and a *convergence* if it additionally satisfies

$$\forall x\in X,\,x\in\lim{}_{\xi}\{x\}^{\uparrow}.$$

The pair (X,ξ) is called a *convergence space* if ξ is a convergence on X. We also write $|\xi|$ for the underlying set X of ξ. Of course, every topology can be considered as a convergence, because the convergence of filters induced by a topology determines this topology.

Given a map $f:X\to Y$ and $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$, let $f[\mathcal{F}]:=\{f(F):F\in\mathcal{F}\}^{\uparrow}$. Given convergences ξ and τ, a map $f:|\xi|\to|\tau|$ is *continuous* if

$$f(\lim{}_{\xi}\mathcal{F})\subseteq\lim{}_{\tau}f[\mathcal{F}].$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A20, 54A05, 54D10, 54B30, 54B05, 54C05, 54C35.

More generally, we can extend convergence to filter-bases by $\lim_\xi \mathcal{B} := \lim_\xi \mathcal{B}^\uparrow$, so that we do not distinguish between a filter-base and the filter it generates unless explicitly needed. The category with convergence spaces as objects and continuous maps as morphisms is denoted **Conv**. The category **Top** of topological spaces and continuous maps is a full subcategory. **Conv** is topological category, that is, admits final and initial structures. Thus subspace and product structures are defined as usual as the initial structures for the inclusion map, and for projections, respectively. In particular, if $A \subset X$ where (X, ξ) is a convergence space, $\xi_{|A}$ denotes the convergence induced on A by ξ, that is, $a \in \lim_{\xi_{|A}} \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $a \in \lim_\xi i[\mathcal{F}]$ where $i : A \to X$ is the inclusion map.

The *adherence* of a filter $\mathcal{F}$ for a convergence ξ is by definition

$$\mathrm{adh}_\xi \mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F})} \lim{}_\xi \mathcal{U}$$

and we write $\mathrm{adh}_\xi F$ for $\mathrm{adh}_\xi \{F\}^\uparrow$. Given $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{|\xi|}$ we define

$$\mathrm{adh}_\xi^\natural \mathcal{A} := \{\mathrm{adh}_\xi A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

A convergence ξ is said to be *regular* if

$$\lim{}_\xi \mathcal{F} \subseteq \lim{}_\xi (\mathrm{adh}_\xi^\natural \mathcal{F})$$

for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}|\xi|$. An alternative characterization (see, e.g., [6]) is that (X, ξ) is regular if and only if

$$\lim{}_\xi \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \lim{}_\xi l[\mathcal{F}]$$

for every non-empty set A, every maps $l : A \to X$ and $\mathcal{S} : A \to \mathbb{F}X$ with $l(a) \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{S}(a)$ for every $a \in A$.

Regularity can be localized: we call a point x of a convergence space (X, ξ) a *regularity point* if

$$x \in \lim{}_\xi \mathcal{F} \Longrightarrow x \in \lim{}_\xi \mathrm{adh}_\xi^\natural \mathcal{F},$$

equivalently if

$$x \in \lim{}_\xi \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}) \Longrightarrow x \in \lim{}_\xi l[\mathcal{F}],$$

for every non-empty set A, every maps $l : A \to X$ and $\mathcal{S} : A \to \mathbb{F}X$ with $l(a) \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{S}(a)$ for every $a \in A$.

A convergence ξ is a *pretopology* if

$$\lim{}_\xi \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{D}} \mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{D}} \lim{}_\xi \mathcal{F}$$

for every $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{F}|\xi|$.

A convergence space (X, ξ) is *diagonal* if for every map $\mathcal{S} : X \to \mathbb{F}X$ such that $x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{S}(x)$ for all $x \in X$,

$$\lim{}_\xi \mathcal{F} \subseteq \lim{}_\xi \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}),$$

for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}X$. A convergence is a topology if and only if it is a diagonal pretopology.

Given a convergence ξ on X, there exist the finest pretopology $S_0\xi$ that is coarser than ξ, and the finest topology $T\xi$ that is coarser than ξ. The maps S_0 and T define concrete functors from **Conv** to the full subcategories **PreTop** of pretopological spaces, and **Top** of topological spaces respectively. These two functors are reflectors.

1.2. **Convergence-approach spaces.** Convergence-approach spaces, introduced in [7], generalize convergence spaces.

A map $\lambda : (\mathbb{F}X) \to [0,\infty]^X$ is called a *preconvergence-approach limit* on X if

$$\forall \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}X,\ \lambda(\mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{G})(\cdot) = \lambda(\mathcal{F})(\cdot) \vee \lambda(\mathcal{G})(\cdot),$$

([1]) and a *convergence-approach limit* if it additionally satisfies

$$\forall x \in X,\ \lambda(\{x\}^{\uparrow})(x) = 0.$$

The pair (X, λ) is called a *convergence-approach space*, or CAP space. We often denote a CAP space (X, λ) simply by X and we denote by λ_X the associated limit.

A function $f : X \to Y$ between two convergence-approach spaces is a *contraction* if

$$\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{F}])(f(\cdot)) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(\cdot)$$

for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}X$. We denote by **Cap** the category of convergence-approach spaces and contractions. This is a topological category, so that subspace and product structures are defined as usual as the initial structures for the inclusion map, and for projections respectively. In particular, if A is a subset of a CAP space (X, λ), the subspace convergence-approach limit is $\lambda_{|A}$ defined by $\lambda_{|A}(\mathcal{F})(a) = \lambda(i[\mathcal{F}])(a)$ where $i : A \to X$ is the inclusion map.

Each convergence space (X, ξ) can also be considered a convergence-approach space by letting

$$\lambda_\xi(\mathcal{F})(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{F} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Conv is included reflectively and coreflectively in **Cap**: If (X, λ) is a convergence-approach space, the **Conv**-coreflection $c(\lambda)$ is defined by $x \in \lim_{c(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\lambda(\mathcal{F})(x) = 0$, while the **Conv**-reflection $r(\lambda)$ is defined by $x \in \lim_{r(\lambda)} \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\lambda(\mathcal{F})(x) < \infty$.

Similarly to adherence of sets in convergence spaces, we define, given a CAP space (X, λ), a subset A of X and $\epsilon \geq 0$, the ϵ-adherence of A:

$$A^{(\epsilon)} = \{x \in X : \exists \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}X,\ A \in \mathcal{U},\ \lambda(\mathcal{U})(x) \leq \epsilon\},$$

and we let $\mathcal{A}^{(\epsilon)} := \{A^{(\epsilon)} : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ whenever $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^X$.

Let $\oplus : [0,\infty] \times [0,\infty] \to [0,\infty]$ be a commutative and associative binary operation such that

$$0 \oplus r = r \tag{1.1}$$

$$r \oplus \bigwedge_{a \in A} a = \bigwedge_{a \in A} (r \oplus a) \tag{1.2}$$

for every $r \in [0,\infty]$, and $A \subseteq [0,\infty]$ ([2]). The two leading examples are the usual addition $+$ of $[0,\infty]$, and pairwise maximum $\vee$.

Note that (1.2) ensures that $\oplus$ preserves order, that is,

$$a \leq b \text{ and } c \leq d \Longrightarrow a \oplus c \leq b \oplus d, \tag{1.3}$$

---

[1] This condition implies in particular that

$$\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{G} \implies \lambda(\mathcal{F})(\cdot) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{G})(\cdot).$$

[2] that is, $[0,\infty]$ is a quantale for the reverse order, with neutral element 0.

and thus $\vee \leq \oplus$, by combining (1.3) with (1.1). Moreover, (1.2) also gives

$$(a+\epsilon)\oplus(b+\epsilon) \underset{\epsilon\to 0}{\to} a\oplus b. \tag{1.4}$$

A convergence-approach space (X,λ) is *$\oplus$-regular* if

$$\lambda(\mathcal{F}^{(\epsilon)})(\cdot) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{F})(\cdot)\oplus\epsilon \tag{1.5}$$

for all $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$ and $\epsilon\in[0,\infty]$. $+$-regularity and $\vee$-regularity are usually called *regularity* and *strong regularity* respectively [1]. Like regularity in **Conv**, an alternative characterization of $\oplus$-regularity is available (see, e.g., [1]): a CAP space (X,λ) is $\oplus$-regular if and only if

$$\lambda(l[\mathcal{F}])(\cdot) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(\cdot)\oplus\bigvee_{a\in A}\lambda(\mathcal{S}(a))(l(a)) \tag{1.6}$$

for every $A\neq\emptyset$, $l:A\to X$ and $\mathcal{S}:A\to\mathbb{F}X$.

Regularity can be localized: we call a point x of a CAP space a *$\oplus$-regularity point* if (1.5), equivalently (1.6), is satisfied at x.

A CAP space (X,λ_X) is *$\oplus$-diagonal* if

$$\lambda(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(\cdot) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{F})(\cdot)\oplus\bigvee_{a\in X}\lambda(\mathcal{S}(a))(a)$$

for every $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}X$ and $\mathcal{S}:X\to\mathbb{F}X$. Note that a $+$-diagonal CAP space is usually called *diagonal.*

A *pre-approach space* (X,λ) is a CAP space satisfying

$$\lambda\left(\bigcap_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{D}}\mathcal{F}\right)=\bigvee_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{D}}\lambda\mathcal{F},$$

for every $\mathbb{D}\subseteq\mathbb{F}X$.

A pre-approach space that is $+$-diagonal is called an *approach space* (e.g., [7]). More generally, we call *$\oplus$-approach space* a pre-approach space that is $\oplus$-diagonal. $\vee$-approach spaces are also called *non-archimedean approach spaces*, because a metric approach space is non-archimedan in the metric sense if and only if it is non-archimedean in the **Cap** sense [1].

$\oplus$-approach spaces form a reflective full subcategories of **Cap**, and we denote the associated reflector by $T_\oplus$.

2. Regularity and Hom-structures

If (X,ξ) and (Y,τ) are two convergence spaces, then we define on the set Y^X of functions from X to Y the preconvergence of *continuous convergence* $[X,Y]$ by:

$$f\in\lim\nolimits_{[X,Y]}\mathcal{F}\Leftrightarrow\forall x\in X,\,\forall\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X: x\in\lim\nolimits_\xi\mathcal{G}\Longrightarrow f(x)\in\lim\nolimits_\tau\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle,$$

where $\langle G,F\rangle := \{h(x): h\in F,\, x\in G\}$ and

$$\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle := \{\langle G,F\rangle : G\in\mathcal{G},\, F\in\mathcal{F}\}^\uparrow.$$

The condition that $f\in\lim_{[X,Y]}\{f\}^\uparrow$ is equivalent to the continuity of f. Thus $[X,Y]$ is a convergence on the set $C(X,Y)$ of continuous maps from X to Y. Continuous convergence is the canonical function space structure in **Conv**, making **Conv** a cartesian closed category.

Theorem 1. [8, Theorem 2.4] *If (X,ξ) and (Y,τ) are convergence spaces and Y is regular then for every $f\in Y^X$, and $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}Y^X$,*

$$f\in\lim_{[X,Y]}\mathcal{F}\Rightarrow f\in C(X,Y).$$

The original proof of Wolk using nets is more complicated than the following folklore argument:

Proof. Let $x_0\in\lim_\xi\mathcal{G}$. We want to show that $f(x_0)\in\lim_\tau f[\mathcal{G}]$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ converges continuously to f, we have $f(x_0)\in\lim_\tau\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle$. By regularity, $f(x_0)\in\lim_\tau\operatorname{adh}^\natural\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle$ and $f[\mathcal{G}]\supseteq\operatorname{adh}^\natural\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle$ because $f(x)\in\lim_\tau\langle x,\mathcal{F}\rangle$ for each $x\in G\in\mathcal{G}$ so that $f(G)\subseteq\operatorname{adh}\langle G,F\rangle$. Therefore, $f(x_0)\in\lim_\tau f[\mathcal{G}]$ and f is continuous. $\square$

Wolk goes on to prove the converse among topological spaces. Namely:

Theorem 2. [8, Theorem 2.6] *If Y is a non-regular* topological *space then there exists a topological space X a function $f\in Y^X$ and a filter $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}(Y^X)$ with $f\in\lim_{[X,Y]}\mathcal{F}$ but f is not continuous.*

The proof of Wolk, using nets, is relatively convoluted and doesn't seem to straightforwardly extend to a general convergence space Y. A proof using filters can be found in [3, (1) iff (2) in Satz 2.2.3], but the construction is also more complicated than ours, despite the fact that it only applies to **Conv**.

In this section we will provide analogues of Wolk's characterization of regularity for CAP spaces, characterizing both regularity and strong regularity in the sense of [1]. Our result particularizes to a characterization of a regular *convergence space* that provides a variant of Wolk's for arbitrary convergence spaces Y, and simplifies the proof. However, in our construction, X does not need to be topological when Y is.

The **Cap** analogue of the continuous convergence is defined by ([3])

$$\lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f):=\inf\{\alpha\in[0,\infty]:\forall\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X,\ \lambda_Y\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle(f(\cdot))\leq\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot)\vee\alpha\}.$$

We define the $\oplus$*-default of contraction* of a function $f\in Y^X$, denoted $m_\oplus(f)$, in the following way:

$$m_\oplus(f):=\inf\{\alpha\in[0,\infty]:\forall\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X,\ \lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(\cdot)\leq\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot)\oplus\alpha\}.$$

It is clear that a function f is a contraction if and only if $m_\oplus(f)=0$. Note that

$$m_+(f)\leq m_\vee(f).$$

Theorem 3. *A convergence-approach space Y is $\oplus$-regular if and only if for every convergence approach space X and $f\in Y^X$,*

$$m_\oplus(f)\leq\left(\bigwedge_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}(Y^X)}\lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f)\right)\oplus\left(\bigwedge_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}(Y^X)}\lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f)\right).$$

---

[3] We could consider a variant with a tensor $\oplus$ on $[0,\infty]$ verifying (1.1) and (1.2):

$$\lambda_{[X,Y]_\oplus}(\mathcal{F})(f):=\inf\{\alpha\in[0,\infty]:\forall\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}X,\ \lambda_Y\langle\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}\rangle(f(\cdot))\leq\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot)\oplus\alpha\},$$

but that would make little difference in our results, even though it would complicate statements by forcing the introduction of two different tensors on $[0,\infty]$. Thus we prefer focusing on the canonical hom-structure $\lambda_{[X,Y]}$ of **Cap**.

In particular, considering convergence spaces as convergence-approach spaces, we get as an immediate corollary:

Corollary 4. *A convergence space* Y *is regular if and only if*

$$f \in \lim_{[X,Y]}\mathcal{F} \Longrightarrow f \in C(X,Y)$$

for every convergence space X*, every* $f \in Y^X$ *and every* $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)$*.*

We will need the following observation (whose **Conv** analogue constitutes the proof of Theorem 1) to prove Theorem 3.

Lemma 5. *If* $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$*,* $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}X$*,* $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)$ *and* $f \in Y^X$ *satisfy*

$$\lambda_Y(\langle x, \mathcal{F}\rangle)(f(x)) \leq \alpha,$$

for every $x \in X$*, then*

$$f[\mathcal{G}] \geq \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}\rangle^{(\alpha)}.$$

Note that the case $\alpha = 0$ states that if $\mathcal{F}$ converges pointwise to $f \in Y^X$ then for any $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}X$, $f[\mathcal{G}] \geq \mathrm{adh}^{\natural}_{r(\lambda_Y)}\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}\rangle$.

Proof. Let $x \in G$ for some $G \in \mathcal{G}$. We consider the filter $\langle \{x\}^{\uparrow}, \mathcal{F}\rangle$ on $\langle G, F\rangle$ for $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then by the assumption,

$$\lambda_Y(\langle \{x\}^{\uparrow}, \mathcal{F}\rangle)(f(x)) \leq \alpha,$$

so $f(x) \in \langle G, F\rangle^{(\alpha)}$. Thus $f(G) \subseteq \langle G, F\rangle^{(\alpha)}$ for any $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$, so $f[\mathcal{G}] \geq \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}\rangle^{(\alpha)}$. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Let Y be a regular convergence-approach space and let

$$c := \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f).$$

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)$ such that $\lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F}_\epsilon)(f) < c+\epsilon$, and, by definition of $[X,Y]$, there is $\alpha_\epsilon < \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F}_\epsilon)(f) + \epsilon < c + 2\epsilon$ such that $\lambda \left\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon \right\rangle (f(\cdot)) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot) \vee \alpha_\epsilon$ for every $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}X$. In particular,

$$\lambda \left\langle \{x\}^{\uparrow}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon \right\rangle (f(x)) \leq \lambda_X(\{x\}^{\uparrow})(x) \vee \alpha_\epsilon = \alpha_\epsilon$$

so that $f[\mathcal{G}] \geq \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon\rangle^{(\alpha_\epsilon)}$ by Lemma 5.

Since Y is $\oplus$-regular,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_Y(\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon\rangle^{(\alpha_\epsilon)})(f(\cdot)) \leq \lambda \left\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon \right\rangle (f(\cdot)) \oplus \alpha_\epsilon &\leq (\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot) \vee \alpha_\epsilon) \oplus \alpha_\epsilon, \\ &\leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot) \oplus (\alpha_\epsilon \oplus \alpha_\epsilon),\end{aligned}$$

using (1.3) and the fact that $\vee \leq \oplus$. Thus $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(f(\cdot)) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot) \oplus (\alpha_\epsilon \oplus \alpha_\epsilon)$ because $f[\mathcal{G}] \geq \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_\epsilon\rangle^{(\alpha_\epsilon)}$. However, $\alpha_\epsilon \oplus \alpha_\epsilon < (c + 2\epsilon) \oplus (c + 2\epsilon)$, and since ϵ is arbitrary, the inequality becomes $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(f(\cdot)) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(\cdot) \oplus (c \oplus c)$ by (1.4), and we have that $m_\oplus(f) \leq c \oplus c$.

For the converse, assume that Y is not $\oplus$-regular. Then there exists $A \neq \emptyset$, $\ell : A \to Y$, $\mathcal{S} : A \to \mathbb{F}Y$, $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{F}A$, and $y_0 \in Y$ such that

$$\lambda_Y(\ell[\mathcal{H}])(y_0) > \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}))(y_0) \oplus \bigvee_{a \in A} \lambda_y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a)).$$

Let $X := (Y \times A) \cup A \cup \{x_\infty\}$ where $x_\infty \notin A$. Define $p_Y : Y \times A \to Y$ by $p_Y(y,a) = a$ for all $(y,a) \in Y \times A$, and let $f : X \to Y$ be defined by $f_{|A} = \ell$, $f_{|Y \times A} = p_Y$, and $f(x_\infty) = y_0$. Now we define λ_X by

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})((y,a)) \quad &:= \quad \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \{(y,a)\}^{\uparrow} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(a) \quad &:= \quad \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \{a\}^{\uparrow} \\ \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(a))(l(a)) & \text{if } \mathcal{G} \geq \mathcal{S}(a) \times \{a\}^{\uparrow} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_\infty) \quad &:= \quad \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{G} = \{x_\infty\}^{\uparrow} \\ \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}))(y_0) & \text{if } \mathcal{G} \geq \mathcal{H} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .
\end{aligned}$$

For each $B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ there is $H_B \in \mathcal{H}$ and for each $a \in H_B$, there is $S_a \in \mathcal{S}(a)$ such that $\bigcup_{a \in H_B} S_a \subseteq B$. Let

$$\hat{B} := \{h \in Y^X : h(H_B) \subseteq B \text{ and } h_{|Y \times A} = p_Y \text{ and } h(x_\infty) = y_0\}.$$

The collection $\{\hat{B} : B \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})\}$ has the finite intersection property, and thus generates a filter $\mathcal{F}_0$ on Y^X. We claim that $\lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F}_0)(f) = 0$.

Indeed, if $\mathcal{G} \geq \mathcal{H}$ then $\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0 \rangle \geq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ by definition of $\mathcal{F}_0$, so that

$$\lambda_Y(\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0 \rangle)(y_0) \leq \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}))(y_0) = \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_\infty).$$

If $\mathcal{G} \geq \mathcal{S}(a) \times \{a\}^{\uparrow}$ for some $a \in A$, then $\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0 \rangle \geq \mathcal{S}(a)$ because functions in basic elements of $\mathcal{F}$ satisfy $f_{|Y \times A} = p_Y$. Thus, taking into account that $f(a) = l(a)$

$$\lambda_Y(\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_0 \rangle)(f(a)) \leq \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(a))(l(a)) = \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(a).$$

Finally, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a principal ultrafilter $\{t\}^{\uparrow}$ then $\langle \{t\}^{\uparrow}, \mathcal{F}_0 \rangle = \{f(t)\}^{\uparrow}$ by definition of f and $\mathcal{F}_0$. Hence $\bigwedge\limits_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f) = 0$.

However, $\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty) = \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}))(y_0)$ and $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{H}])(y_0) = \lambda_Y(\ell[\mathcal{H}])(y_0)$, and by our choice of $\mathcal{H}$, we have $\lambda_Y(\ell[\mathcal{H}])(y_0) > \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}))(y_0) \oplus \bigvee\limits_{a \in A} \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a))$. Thus the infimum of α's such that $\lambda_Y(\ell[\mathcal{H}])(y_0) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty) \oplus \alpha$ is necessarily positive, and $m(f) > 0 = \left(\bigwedge\limits_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f) \right) \oplus \left(\bigwedge\limits_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f) \right)$. ☐

Corollary 6. *A convergence-approach space Y is regular if and only if for every convergence approach space X and $f \in Y^X$,*

$$m_+(f) \leq 2 \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f).$$

Corollary 7. *A convergence-approach space Y is strongly regular if and only if for every convergence approach space X and $f \in Y^X$,*

$$m_\vee(f) \leq \bigwedge_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(Y^X)} \lambda_{[X,Y]}(\mathcal{F})(f).$$

3. Regularity and contractive Extensions

In this section, we investigate the conditions under which a contractive map $f : S \to Y$, where $S \subset X$ and X, Y are CAP spaces, can be extended to a contraction defined on a larger subset of X. Such a result was recently obtained by G. J ager [5], but we can refine his result in a way that improves upon what is known, even in the case of convergence spaces. As a result, we obtain new characterizations of regular of strongly regular CAP spaces in terms of a existence of contractive extensions of maps.

Let us first review the situation in **Conv**. If $f : S \to |\tau|$ is continuous where $S \subset |\xi|$, we define the *hull* $h(S, f)$ *of extensionability of* S *for* f by

$$h(S,f) := \{x \in \mathrm{adh}_\xi S : \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}S,\, x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{F}} \lim_\tau f[\mathcal{F}] \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Clearly, f admits a continuous extension to $S \cup \{x\}$ if and only if $x \in h(S, f)$. Thus, the best case scenario is to extend f continuously to $h(S, f)$.

Recall that a convergence space (X, ξ) is *diagonal* if for every map $\mathcal{S} : X \to \mathbb{F}X$ such that $x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{S}(x)$ for all $x \in X$,

$$\lim_\xi \mathcal{F} \subseteq \lim_\xi \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}),$$

for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}X$. Regularity of Y, together with this global diagonal condition, ensure the existence of continuous extensions to $h(S, f)$:

Theorem 8. [2] *A Hausdorff convergence space* (Y, τ) *is regular if and only if for every diagonal convergence space* (X, ξ)*, every subset* S *of* X*, and every continuous map* $f : |\xi_{|S}| \to |\tau|$ *there exists a (unique) continuous map* $\bar{f} : |\xi_{|h(S,f)}| \to |\tau|$ *with* $\bar{f}_{|S} = f$*.*

However, it is apparent that a diagonal condition localized to S should suffice. A subspace $(S, \xi_{|S})$ of a convergence space (X, ξ) is *strict* if ([4]) for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(\mathrm{adh}_\xi S)$ with $x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{F} \cap \mathrm{adh}_\xi S$ there is a $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}X$ with $S \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mathrm{adh}_\xi^\natural \mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{F}$, and $x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{G}$. It is easily seen that if ξ is diagonal, then every subspace is strict, so that Cook's theorem 8 follows from the following result of Frič and Kent (who seem to have been unaware of Cook's result).

Theorem 9. [4, Theorem 1.1] *A convergence space* (Y, τ) *is regular if and only if, whenever* $(S, \xi_{|S})$ *is a strict subspace of* $(h(S, f), \xi_{|h(S,f)})$ *and* $f : (S, \xi_{|S}) \to (Y, \tau)$ *is a continuous map there exists a continuous map* $\bar{f} : (h(S, f), \xi_{|h(S,f)}) \to (Y, \tau)$ *with* $\bar{f}_{|S} = f$*.*

In fact, the result of [4, Theorem 1.1] is formulated somewhat differently, but is essentially equivalent to Theorem 9. Indeed, strict subspaces in [4] are assumed to be dense, and the terminology used is different.

The aforemetioned CAP extension result from [5] mirrors Cook's result (Theorem [2]) and is stated below (Theorem 10). Using notion from [5], we define the following **Cap** analogue of the hull of extensionability. Given two CAP spaces (X, λ_X) and

---

[4] The additional condition that $(S, \xi_{|S})$ is dense in (X, ξ), that is $\mathrm{adh}_\xi S = X$, is usually added, e.g., [4].

(Y, λ_Y), $x \in X$, and $\epsilon \in [0, \infty]$, define

$$\begin{aligned} H_S^\epsilon(x) &:= \{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}S : \lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x) \leq \epsilon\} \\ F_S^\epsilon(x) &:= \begin{cases} \{y \in Y : \forall \mathcal{F} \in H_S^\epsilon(x),\ \lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{F}])(y) \leq \epsilon\} & \text{if } H_S^\epsilon(x) \neq \emptyset \\ Y & \text{if } H_S^\epsilon(x) = \emptyset \end{cases} \\ h(S, f) &:= \{x \in S^{(0)} : \bigcap_{\alpha \in [0,\infty]} F_S^\alpha(x) \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 10. [5]*Let (X, λ_X) be a diagonal CAP space, (Y, λ_Y) and let $S \subseteq X$ be equipped with the induced convergence-approach limit from λ_X. Then for every contraction $f : S \to Y$ there exists a contraction $g : h(S, f) \to Y$ with $g_{|S} = f$.*

Given a contraction $f : S \to Y$ where $S \subseteq X$, we call a function $g : h(S, f) \to Y$ with $g_{|S} = f$ and $g(x) \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in [0,\infty]} F_S^\alpha(x)$ for each $x \in h(S, f) \backslash S$ an *admissible extension* of f. If each $g(x)$ is also a $\oplus$-regularity point, then we call g a *$\oplus$-regular extension* of f. Note that we can adopt a similar terminology in **Conv** ([5]).

We generalize Theorem 10 by introducing the appropriate notion of strictness in **Cap**, and localizing the regularity condition.

Let (X, λ) be a CAP space and $S \subseteq X$. Then S is a *$\oplus$-strict* subspace if for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(S^{(0)})$ and $x \in S^{(0)}$ there is $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}S$ such that $\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)} \leq \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{G})(x) \oplus \epsilon \leq \lambda(\mathcal{F})(x)$. Note that a $+$-strict subspace is also $\vee$-strict.

Similarly, given $\epsilon \geq 0$, we call a subspace S of a CAP space X *ϵ-$\oplus$-strict* if for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(S^{(0)})$ and $x \in S^{(0)}$ there is $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}S$ such that $\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)} \leq \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{G})(x) \oplus \epsilon \leq \lambda(\mathcal{F})(x)$. Of course, an ϵ-$\oplus$-strict subspace is $\oplus$-strict. In particular a subspace of a convergence space is strict if and only if it is $\oplus$-strict, equivalently ϵ-$\oplus$-strict for some $\epsilon < \infty$, when considered as a CAP space.

Proposition 11. *If (X, λ) is a $\oplus$-diagonal CAP space, then every subspace is 0-$\oplus$-strict, hence $\oplus$-strict.*

Proof. Let $S \subseteq X$, and let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}(S^{(0)})$ with $x_0 \in S^{(0)}$. We pick $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F_0 \subseteq S^{(0)}$. For each $x \in F_0$, there is a $\mathcal{S}(x) \in \mathbb{F}S$ such that $\lambda(\mathcal{S}(x))(x) = 0$. Since (X, λ) is $\oplus$-diagonal, we let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$

$$\lambda(\mathcal{G})(x_0) = \lambda(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(x_0) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{F})(x_0) \oplus \bigvee_{x \in F_0} \lambda(\mathcal{S}(x))(x) = \lambda(\mathcal{F})(x_0).$$

□

Thus, our **Cap** analogue of Theorem 9 generalizes Theorem 10.

Theorem 12. *If S is a $\oplus$-strict subspace of a convergence approach space (X, λ_X) and $f : S \to Y$ a contraction, then every $\oplus$-regular extension $g : h(S, f) \to Y$ of f is a contraction.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}h(S, f)$, $x_0 \in h(S, f)$, and set $\lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x_0) = \alpha$. Consider $g(x_0) \in \bigcap_{\epsilon \in [0,\infty]} F_S^\epsilon(x_0)$ where g is a $\oplus$-regular extension of f. Since $(S, (\lambda_X)_{|S})$ is a $\oplus$-strict subspace of X and $h(S,f) \subseteq S^{(0)}$, there is a $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}S$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)} \leq \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_0) \oplus \epsilon \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x_0)$. Since $\mathcal{F} \geq \mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)}$, $g[\mathcal{F}] \geq g[\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)}]$, and we claim that $g[\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)}] \geq (g[\mathcal{G}])^{(\epsilon)}$ because $g(G^{(\epsilon)}) \subseteq (g(G))^{(\epsilon)}$. Indeed, if $y \in g(G^{(\epsilon)})$ there is $x \in G^{(\epsilon)}$ with $g(x) = y$. There is a $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{U}G \subseteq \mathbb{U}S$ such that $\lambda(\mathcal{U})(x) \leq \epsilon$, that is, $\mathcal{U} \in H_S^{\epsilon}(x)$. Since g is an admissible extension of f, $y = g(x) \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in [0,\infty]} F_S^{\alpha}(x)$ so that in particular $y \in F_S^{\epsilon}(x)$ and $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{U}])(y) \leq \epsilon$. Moreover, $f[\mathcal{U}] \in \mathbb{F}(f(G)) = \mathbb{F}(g(G))$. Thus $y \in (g(G))^{(\epsilon)}$.

---

[5] Namely if $f : S \to Y$ is continuous for $S \subset X$, we call a function $g : h(S, f) \to Y$ with $g_{|S} = f$ and $g(x) \in \bigcap_{x \in \lim_\xi \mathcal{F};\, S \in \mathcal{F}} \lim_\tau f[\mathcal{F}]$ for each $x \in h(S, f)$ an *admissible extension of f*. If moreover each $g(x)$ is a regularity point, g is a *regular extension of f*.

Thus

$$\lambda_Y(g[\mathcal{F}])(g(x_0)) \leq \lambda_Y(g[\mathcal{G}^{(\epsilon)}])(g(x_0)) \leq \lambda_Y(g[\mathcal{G}]^{(\epsilon)})(g(x_0)) = \lambda_Y((f[\mathcal{G}])^{(\epsilon)})(g(x_0)),$$

because $g_{|S} = f$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}S$.

Moreover, $g(x_0)$ is a $\oplus$-regularity point because g is a $\oplus$-regular extension, so that $\lambda_Y((f[\mathcal{G}])^{(\epsilon)})(g(x_0)) \leq \lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(g(x_0)) \oplus \epsilon$. Since f is a contraction, $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(g(x_0)) \oplus \epsilon \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_0) \oplus \epsilon$, by (1.3). Note that ϵ was picked such that $\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_0) \oplus \epsilon \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x_0)$, so that $\lambda_Y(g[\mathcal{F}])(g(x_0)) \leq \lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x_0)$, thus showing that g is a contractive extension of f. □

Corollary 13. *If S is a $\oplus$-strict subspace of (X,λ_X) and (Y,λ_Y) is a $\oplus$-regular convergence approach space, then every admissible extension $g : h(S,f) \to Y$ of a contraction $f : S \to Y$ is a contraction.*

The restriction of Theorem 12 to **Conv** is essentially (in fact, it is slightly more general than) the direct part of Theorem 9:

Corollary 14. *If S is a strict subspace of a convergence space X, then every regular extension $g : h(S,f) \to Y$ of a continuous map $f : S \to Y$ is continuous. In particular, if Y is regular, every admissible extension $g : h(S,f) \to Y$ of a continuous map $f : S \to Y$ is continuous.*

As for the converse, we have:

Theorem 15. *If (Y,λ_Y) is not $\oplus$-regular, then there is a $\oplus$-*approach space *(X,λ_X) and a ($\oplus$-strict) subspace S and a contraction $f : S \to Y$ which has a non-contractive admissible extension.*

Proof. Since Y is not $\oplus$-regular, there exists $A \neq \emptyset$, $\ell : A \to Y$, $\mathcal{S} : A \to \mathbb{F}Y$, $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}A$, and $y_0 \in Y$ such that

$$\lambda_Y(\ell[\mathcal{F}])(y_0) > \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(y_0) \oplus \bigvee_{a \in A} \lambda_y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a)).$$

Let (X,λ_X) be defined as in the proof of Theorem 3. We let $T_{\oplus}\lambda_X$ denote the $\oplus$-approach reflection of λ_X. Then

$$T_{\oplus}\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty) = \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(y_0) \oplus \bigvee_{a \in A} \lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a))$$

if $\mathcal{H} \geq \mathcal{N} := \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \bigcap_{a \in F} (\mathcal{S}(a) \times \{a\}) \wedge \{a\}^{\uparrow}$, and $T_{\oplus}\lambda_X\mathcal{H}(x) = \lambda_X\mathcal{H}(x)$ for any $x \in X \setminus \{x_\infty\}$.

Every subspace of $(X, T_{\oplus}\lambda_X)$ is $\oplus$-strict, because $T_{\oplus}\lambda_X$ is $\oplus$-diagonal. In particular $S := Y \times A$ is a $\oplus$-strict subspace. Note that $f = p_Y$ is a contraction $f : S \to Y$.

We claim that $h(S,f)=X$. Indeed, $A\subseteq h(S,f)$ because if $\mathcal{H}\geq\mathcal{S}(a)\times\{a\}$, $T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(a)=\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(a)=\lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a))$. Also, $\ell(a)\in\bigcap_{\epsilon\in[0,\infty]}F^\epsilon_S(a)$, since $H^\epsilon_S(a)=\{\mathcal{H}\in\mathbb{F}S:\mathcal{H}\geq\mathcal{S}(a)\times\{a\}\}$ and $f[\mathcal{H}]=\mathcal{S}(a)$ imply that $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{H}])(\ell(a))=\lambda(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a))$. Morever $x_\infty\in h(S,f)$ because $y_0\in\bigcap_{\epsilon\in[0,\infty]}F^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)$. Indeed, if $\epsilon<T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{H}\geq\mathcal{N}$, then $H^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)=\emptyset$ because $\mathcal{H}\geq\mathcal{N}\geq\mathcal{G}$ for every $\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}S$, so $T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_\infty)>\epsilon$ and $F^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)=Y$. If on the other hand $\epsilon\geq T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty)$ then

$$H^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)=\{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}S:\lambda_X(\mathcal{G})(x_\infty)\leq\epsilon\}=\{\mathcal{G}:\mathcal{G}\geq\mathcal{N}\vee S\}.$$

So for $\mathcal{G}\in H^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)$, $f[\mathcal{G}]\geq\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{F}]$, and $\lambda_Y(f[\mathcal{G}])(y_0)\leq\lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{F}])(y_0)\leq T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{H})(x_\infty)\leq\epsilon$. Thus $y_0\in F^\epsilon_S(x_\infty)$.

Consider the admissible extension $g:h(S,f)\to Y$ of f defined by $g_{|S}=f$, $g_{|A}=l$ and $g(x_\infty)=y_0$. The map g is not contractive because

$$\lambda_Y(g[\mathcal{F}])(y_0)=\lambda_Y(l[\mathcal{F}])(y_0)>\lambda_Y(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}))(y_0)\oplus\bigvee_{a\in A}\lambda_y(\mathcal{S}(a))(\ell(a))=T_\oplus\lambda_X(\mathcal{F})(x_\infty).$$

□

From Corollary 13 and Theorem 12, we obtain the following generalizations of Theorem 9 to **Cap**.

Corollary 16. *A convergence-approach space (Y,λ_Y) is $\oplus$-regular if and only if for each convergence-approach space (X,λ_X), $\oplus$-strict subspace S, and contraction $f:S\to Y$, every admissible extension of f is a contraction.*

Corollary 17. *A convergence-approach space (Y,λ_Y) is regular if and only if for each convergence-approach space (X,λ_X), $+$-strict subspace S, and contraction $f:S\to Y$, every admissible extension of f is a contraction.*

Corollary 18. *A convergence-approach space (Y,λ_Y) is strongly regular if and only if for each convergence-approach space (X,λ_X), $\vee$-strict subspace S, and contraction $f:S\to Y$, every admissible extension of f is a contraction.*

References

[1] Brock, P., Kent, D.C., 1998, *On convergence approach spaces*, Applied Categorical Structures, **6** (1), p.117-125

[2] Cook, C. H., 1968, *On Continuous Extensions*, Mathematische Annalen **176**, p.302-304.

[3] Evers, K., 2012, *Stetige Konvergenz im Kontext quivalenter Formulierungen des T3-Axioms*, Diplomarbeit am Mathematishen Institut der Universitt Rostock

[4] Frič, R., Kent, D. C., 1992, *Regularity and Extensions of Maps*, Mathematica Slovaca **42**, p.349-357.

[5] G. Jaeger, 2012, *Extensions of contractions and uniform contractions of dense subspaces*, preprint

[6] Kent, D.C., Richardson, G., 1996, *Convergence spaces and diagonal conditions*, Top. Appl., **70**, p.167-174.

[7] Lowen, E., Lowen, R.,1988, *A quasitopos containing CONV and MET as full subcategories*, Int. J. Math. Sci. **19**, 417-438.

[8] Wolk, E., 1975, *Continuous convergence in partially ordered sets*, General Topology and its Applications, **5**, p. 221-234

Mathematical Sciences, POBOX 8093, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30460, USA.

E-mail address: `fmynard@georgiasouthern.edu; wtrott@georgiasouthern.edu`